

The Impact of Employee's Dark-Triad traits on Workplace Bullying: A study in Viet Nam

Huynh Luong Tam, Nguyen Minh Ha

Ho Chi Minh City Open University, 97 Vo Van Tan Street, District 3, Ho Chi Minh
City, Viet Nam

tam.hl@ou.edu.vn (corresponding author), ha.mn@ou.edu.vn

Abstract. Bullying in the workplace is increasingly common and has serious consequences for individuals and organizations. With the aim of understanding the influence of dark-triad traits on becoming victims of workplace bullying for employees working at enterprises in Vietnam, the present study was carried out using the method qualitative and quantitative research. The qualitative research was carried out with group discussion and expert interview stages. While the quantitative research, with two phases pilot-test and formal-study, was conducted. The formal quantitative study was conducted with 1206 respondents from employees of enterprises in Vietnam. Collected data after being analyzed through SPSS software, then analyzed for regression model by SmartPLS software. Research results have found that employee's narcissism and psychopathy trait have an positive effect on being victims of workplace bullying, while employee's machiavellianism trait found no relationship with their being bullied. From this result, the study may suggest managerial implications for reducing the bullying in the workplace.

Keywords: workplace bullying, dark-triad traits, workplace behavior, personality.

1. Introduction

Bullying is a serious occupational psychosocial risk (Hoel et al., 2010), and is reported to occur frequently in the workplace (Nielsen et al., 2010) and the frequency of occurrence has increased in recent years (WBI, 2014). Nielsen et al. (2017) argues that workplace bullying is an important problem in society because employees often face fears about it. A meta-analysis by Nielsen & Einarsen (2012) indicates that workplace bullying is strongly associated with health-related problems. Studies have demonstrated that bullying in an organization increases costs for the organization, adversely affects employee health and safety (Felblinger, 2009) and in particular, bullying increases employees' intention to quit more than any other reason (Al-Hyari, 2023).

Research on workplace bullying has emerged from Scandinavian surveys of school bullying in the late 1980s, then expanded. Leymann (1990), a German psychologist and psychiatrist, is considered a pioneer in this field. According to research in Scandinavia, bullying and harassment in the workplace is a serious problem. At least 5% of the working population here suffers from bullying at work (Einarsen et al., 1994). Studies in Finland and the UK have revealed a higher prevalence of about 10% (Vartia, 1996). Leymann (1990) even found that about 100-300 workers committed suicide due to bullying and harassment in the workplace in Sweden. In 1993, the Northwest National Life Insurance Survey found that 1 in 4 employees would be harassed, threatened or assaulted on the job in the United States. Besides, a national survey of more than 2,500 employees found that 6% of employees had experienced workplace violence and 41.4% experienced psychological aggression at work in the previous 12 months (Schat et al., 2006). In a telephone survey of American workers about their experiences of harassment and discrimination in the workplace, Rospenda et al. (2006) reported that 63% of respondents indicated at least one or more incidents of harassment in the 12 months prior to the study. More than 75% of male employees engage in some form of psychological aggression towards their co-workers (Greenberg & Barling, 1999; Glomb, 2002).

Given the negative consequences of workplace bullying, many researchers have worked hard to identify the factors that determine it. Researchers have examined the occurrence of bullying from two perspectives: (a) work environment hypotheses (Leymann, 1996; Salin & Hoel, 2011) and (b) individual dispositions hypotheses (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003). Srivastava & Agarwal (2020) argue that it is necessary to establish the influence of individual and organizational variables along with workplace bullying to predict other outcomes, which is an important aspect influencing the long-term sustainable growth of the organization. According to Samsudin et al. (2020), the influence of personality on bullying behavior in the workplace needs more research to be able to develop a comprehensive theoretical model of the causes, nature and impacts of workplace bullying. To minimize the negative effects that workplace bullying can have, managers, consultants, and HR staff need to understand the true role personality traits play. This, in turn, helps them avoid making fundamental attribution errors that may lead them to overestimate the role of these traits in the bullying process when dealing with real-

life cases (Nielsen et al., 2017, Nguyen et al., 2021). Likewise, psychologists, advisors, and even family physicians need information about the role personality traits play in the treatment and rehabilitation of victims.

One aspect that has not received much attention in the context of the negative side of organizations is that of employees with a dark-triad traits, a concept that has only recently received academic attention (Spain et al., 2014). Currently, only a few studies have investigated the relationship between Dark-triad traits and being a victim of workplace bullying (Linton & Power, 2013; Fernández-del-Río et al., 2021; Dåderman & Ragestål-Impola, 2019; Pilch & Turska, 2015), and the conclusions of the studies are different. Therefore, it is necessary to study the relationship of Dark-triad traits and being a victim of workplace bullying (Pletzer et al., 2019). That is why the present study explores the relationship between Dark-triad traits and being a victim of workplace bullying in the context in Vietnam to adapt the above requirements.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Workplace bullying

There are two types of harassment: physical and psychological harassment. Aggressive acts of a direct physical nature, such as sexual harassment and even physical assault. Psychological harassment refers to the abuse of workers of a non-physical nature, which in the scientific literature has been conceptualized under many names such as: abusive supervision (Tepper, 2007), incivility (Cortina et al., 2001), bullying/mobbing (Einarsen et al., 2020), victimization (Aquino and Thau, 2009), interpersonal discrimination (Berry et al., 2007), emotional abuse (Keashly & Harvey, 2005), ostracism (Williams, 2007), mobbing and social undermining (Duffy et al., 2002).

Brodsky (1976) stated that workplace harassment is defined as repeated and persistent attempts by a person to torment, upset, disappoint or get a response from others. Perpetrators repeatedly provoke, pressure, frighten, threaten, or annoy the target. Brodsky (1976) uses workplace harassment as a higher order construct to describe systematic but non-physical forms of abuse against and among employees. Key elements of Brodsky's (1976) definition were incorporated into later concepts of harassment, including that of Einarsen et al. (2020) is widely used and in most research on workplace bullying, in a variety of research contexts. Einarsen et al. (2020) define workplace bullying as "harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone's work tasks. In order for the label of bullying to be applied to a particular activity, interaction or process, it has to occur repeatedly and regularly (e.g. weekly) and over a period of time (e.g. about six months). Bullying is an escalating process during which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative social acts." A conflict cannot be called mobbing if the incident is an isolated event or if two parties of approximately equal "strength" are in "conflict". This is also the definition used for this study.

2.2. Dark-triad traits

Personality psychology is a branch of psychology. It studies personality differences between individuals. It sees people as unique, characterized by their own personalities. Personality refers to an individual's stable, relatively persistent tendencies to think, believe, feel, and behave in certain ways (Ones, 2005). There are many different personality models used in studies of workplace bullying such as the Five-Factor Model (Big 5) by McCrae & John (1992), and the HEXACO model by Ashton et al. (2004). The Dark-triad was proposed by Paulhus & Williams in 2002, consisting of three "dark" personality traits that combine together as narcissism, machiavellianism, and psychopathy. These personality traits are receiving more and more attention from many researchers in different fields, especially in the social fields. Researchers have found associations of these personality traits with various antisocial and undesirable behaviours such as manipulation in the workplace (Jonason et al., 2012), academic fraud (Williams et

al., 2010), adult bullying (Baughman et al., 2012), aggression and delinquency, sexual misconduct, interpersonal difficulties (Muris et al., 2017), ...

Person with high narcissism trait tend to be self-aggrandizing, selfish and demeaning to others (Jones & Paulhus, 2010). Machiavellian individuals are characterized by a lack of empathy for others (Paal & Bereczkei, 2007), selfish, ready to manipulate people to benefit themselves, lie and exploit others (Jones & Paulhus, 2009). People with psychopathy trait are characterized by impulsivity, thrill-seeking, low empathy, callousness, and interpersonal manipulation (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

2.3. Four theoretical mechanisms for the relationship between bullying and individual dispositions

The theory of the relationship mechanisms between bullying and individual dispositions was proposed by Nielsen & Knardahl in 2015. According to the authors, the theory is based on two common views about the occurrence of bullying that are: (a) work environment hypotheses (Leymann, 1996; Salin & Hoel, 2011) and (b) individual dispositions hypotheses (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003).

The authors propose four different theoretical mechanisms to explain this relationship. Acting as a null hypothesis, the *no relationship mechanism* suggests that bullying is simply not associated with individual dispositions at all. That means personality is neither a predictor nor an outcome of bullying. Assuming that the bullying behavior is indeed related to the individual's personality, then the second mechanism is labelled the *target-behaviour mechanism*. This mechanism shows that employees in specific situations are not as expected, work less efficiently, annoy others, and even violate social norms of polite and friendly interaction, thereby triggering aggressive behaviours in others (Einarsen, 1999). Therefore, bullying is suggested to be caused by employee behavior with a predisposition or a vulnerable personality (Bowling & Beehr, 2006). This is followed by *the negative perceptions mechanism*, which suggests that certain personal views are associated with a lower threshold for explaining perceived harassment and such employees are at higher risk than others for identifying negative workplace events as bullying (Nielsen et al., 2017). Finally, with *the reverse causality mechanism*, individual predispositions are seen as an outcome rather than a precursor of workplace bullying (Glasø et al., 2007).

2.4. Dark-triad and workplace bullying

Dark-triad traits were found to be strongly associated with social dominance (Muris et al., 2017), interpersonal competition (Neumann et al., 2020), especially is associated with bullying behavior in adults (Baughman et al., 2012). Therefore, the present study predicts that these personality traits will be associated with workplace bullying through the theory of the relationship mechanisms between bullying and individual dispositions by Nielsen & Knardahl (2015).

People with high levels of machiavellianism also showed significantly higher self-perception than those with narcissism. Jonason et al. (2012) linked machiavellianism to hard (e.g., threatening) and soft (e.g., praise) manipulation in the workplace. In theory, machiavellian individuals will do whatever it takes to maintain control and position themselves for success (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

Highly machiavellian individuals are found to be at high risk of becoming victims of workplace bullying (Fernández-del-Río et al., 2021). Certain characteristics of machiavellianism may incite others to bully with the target-behaviour mechanism by Nielsen & Knardahl (2015). In addition to attracting and stimulating bullying behaviours with positive aspects, in negative aspects such as acts of manipulation, deception or taking advantage of others also violate social

norms, annoying people around. As a result, people with high machiavellianism are more likely to fall victim to bullying behaviours in the workplace. Linton & Power (2013) find that victims of workplace bullying also have machiavellianism traits. Therefore, the following research hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Employees with highly machiavellianism personality are more likely to fall victim to bullying in the workplace.

People with high narcissism often perceive negative behaviours as a sign of weakness in the face of others (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Fatima (2016) found that narcissism personality was positively correlated with being a victim. While Fernández-del-Río et al. (2021) found that highly narcissistic individual were found to be at a lower risk of becoming victims of workplace bullying. It was explained that because people with narcissism personality often have feelings of pride and superiority, it can be difficult for them to admit that they have been bullied at work.

Many studies have found a relationship between narcissism and bullying behavior in the workplace by assuming that employees with high narcissism feel contempt for their colleagues. They feel that their co-workers may be obstructing (Judge et al., 2006; Penney & Spector, 2002; Reidy et al., 2008). With such characteristics, according to the target-behaviour mechanism by Neilsen & Knardahl (2015), with these tendencies and behaviours in mind, highly narcissistic employees can be annoying, discouraging, and even violate social norms of polite and friendly interaction. From there they create triggers for workplace bullying from others (co-workers/superiors) and become victims of workplace bullying. Based on the above arguments, the following research hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Employees with highly narcissism personality are more likely to fall victim to bullying in the workplace.

Psychopathy are also associated with tough interactions (Jonason et al., 2012). Patrick et al. (2009) linked psychopathy personality with unethical decision-making, poor treatment of colleagues, including bullying, public criticism, coercion, and human rights violations (Boddy, 2011). Psychopathy has the strongest correlation with bullying behaviours compared with other personality traits in the Dark-triad (Baughman et al., 2012; Linton & Power, 2013; Fatima, 2016). Not many previous studies have found a relationship between psychopathy and being a victim of workplace bullying. However, according to the target-behaviour mechanism by Neilsen & Knardahl (2015), in workplace, aggressive behaviours and poor treatment of co-workers or other negative behaviours by employees with psychopathy will stimulate enjoys hostility and retaliatory behaviours from around, including workplace bullying. Research by Linton & Power (2013) also found that people with psychopathy are more likely to be targets of workplace bullying. Therefore, the research hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H3: Employees with highly psychopathy personality are more likely to fall victim to bullying in the workplace.

3. Research Method

Measurement: The *workplace bullying* is measured by the Negative Behavior Questionnaire-Revised by Einarsen et al. (2009), including 22 questions. While the *Dark triad* is measured by the 27-question scale of Jones & Paulhus (2014). The survey questionnaire is designed according to Likert five-point scale, “1-Totally disagree”, “2-Disagree”, “3-Neutral”, “4-Agree”, “5. Totally agree”.

Qualitative research: Qualitative research conducted through 02 stages: group discussion and expert interview.

Group discussion stage: this study implemented a non-probability sampling method, conducted a conversation with a group of 10 staff members who are working at enterprises in Vietnam. These respondents were from many different industries and from many different types of businesses. At this stage, this study edits the words to suit the research context from the original scale. After the discussion, the study added 02 observed variables to the scale of "Dark-triad" and 03 observed variables to the scale of "Workplace bullying".

Expert interview stage: This study conducted interviews with 6 experts, who have a Doctor of Business Administration degree, with experience and scientific research capacity. The results at this stage are that the research has removed 01 observed variable of the "Workplace bullying" scale and removed 01 observed variable of the "Psychopathy" scale. At the same time, the study also adjusted the reversed questions of the "Dark-triad" scale to avoid misunderstanding for the respondents.

Quantitative research: Quantitative research conducted through 02 stages: pilot test and formal quantitative research.

Pilot test stage: The survey questionnaire was designed via google form and then sent the survey link via the internet (skype, email, facebook), and also printed and sent directly to the respondents. The survey collected data from 207 respondents, who are employees of enterprises in Vietnam. The collected data will be analyzed for reliability and convergence by Cronbach Alpha coefficient and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) by SPSS software. The analysis results show that the scale "Workplace bullying" excludes 04 observed variables. While, the personality scale "Machiavellianism" is excluded with 2 observed variables, "Narcissism" is excluded with 4 observed variables, "Psychopathy" is excluded with 2 observed variables. The reason for excluding the above variables is the corrected item-total correlation of these variables is less than 0.7 when performing the Cronbach Alpha test (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The scale is then unchanged after the EFA process.

Formal quantitative research stage: The formal survey questionnaire, which was adjusted from pilot-test stage, was printed then send it to the respondents to answer directly, as well as conducted via the internet (Skype, email, Facebook, ...) by Google form link. The research sample is employees working at enterprises in Vietnam. The study collected 1206 valid responses and included them in data analysis as Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of research sample

		N	%
Gender	Male	493	40.9
	Femal	713	59.1
Age	18-25 years old	355	29.4
	26-35 years old	529	43.9
	36-45 years old	222	18.4
	Above 46 years old	100	8.3
Monthly income (VND)	< 10 million VND	133	11
	10-20 million VND	630	52.2
	20-30 million VND	335	27.8
	> 30 million VND	108	9
Experience in current workplace	< 2 years	189	15.7
	2-5 years	532	44.1
	> 5 years	485	40.2
Enterprise type	Limited/Private Enterprises	318	26.4
	Joint Stock Enterprises	387	32.1
	Foreign investment Enterprises	184	15.3
	State-owned Enterprises	235	19.4
	Others	82	6.8

Gender: The number of respondents participating in the study was less male with only 40.9%. Thus, the research sample is characterized by the majority being female in terms of gender.

Age: The research sample is young, with the age group from 26 to 35 accounting for the highest proportion with 43.9%. Followed by the group of 18 to 25 years old with 29.4%. The groups of respondents aged from 35 to 46 years old and the group over 46 years old had lower rates, with 18.4% and 8.3% respectively.

Enterprise type: The sample is diverse in terms of the type of business that the respondents are working for. The highest percentage is the group of respondents who are working in joint-stock companies with 32.1%. Followed by two groups of respondents working in private/limited liability enterprises and state-owned enterprises, with 26.4% and 19.4% respectively. Finally, the group of respondents working for foreign-invested enterprises with 15.3% and for other types of enterprises with 6.8%.

Experience in current workplace: Most of the respondents have at least 2 years of work experience in their current workplace. Specifically, the group of respondents with 2 to 5 years of working experience accounted for the largest proportion with 44.1% and the group of respondents with more than 5 years of working experience with 40.2%. The group of respondents with less than 2 years of

working experience accounted for only 15.7%.

Monthly income: The majority of respondents participating in the study are employees with incomes from 10 to 20 million VND, accounting for 52.2%. Next is the group of employees with incomes from 20 to 30 million VND, accounting for 27.8%. Finally, the two groups of employees whose income is less than 10 million VND is greater than 30 million VND, accounting for a lower proportion with 11% and 9% respectively.

4. Results

Machiavellianism: The observed variables in the Machiavellianism personality scale are evaluated ranging from level 1 to level 5. The mean value of observed variables in the scale is larger than level 3 and smaller than level 4. Thus, employees in enterprises in Vietnam have low *Machiavellianism* personality. The mean value reached the lowest value of 3.376 at variable MA1 and reached the highest value of 3.65 at variable MA2 and MA5. Employees of enterprises in Vietnam are less likely to agree to keep their secrets, but they prefer to use ingenious methods to work their way and often track other people's information because it can be used against them later.

Narcissism: Observed variables on the scale of *Narcissism* personality scale are assessed at a level from 1 to 5. The mean value of the observed variables is greater than 3. In general, the employees participating in the survey have *narcissism* personality traits are not high. In which, the mean value of the observed variable NA3 reached the highest value of 3.634 and the mean value reached the lowest value of 3.6 at the variables NA1 and NA10. As such, employees in enterprises in Vietnam are less likely to feel they can be born leaders, are less often compared with famous people and are also less likely to consider them important to others. However, they feel that group activities will become duller without them.

Psychopathy: The observed variables of the employee's *Psychopathy* personality scale are rated from level 1 to level 5. The mean value of the observed variables is 3 greater than the mean, and there is no significant difference between the variables. Psychopathy personality is generally not much in the employees at the enterprises participating in the survey. In which, the highest mean is 3.587 at PS8 and the lowest mean is 3.556 at PS4, PS5 and PS6. This shows that employees in enterprises in Vietnam are less likely to think that they can be mean to others and are less likely to be told that they are out of control. However, they are more likely to agree to be willing to do anything to get what they want.

Workplace bullying: The observed variables of the scale of workplace bullying are rated from 1 to 5. The mean value of the observed variables is greater than 3. Therefore, employees feel they are being bullied in the workplace even though it is not clear. In which, WPB5 has the highest mean value of 3.384, which shows that employees at enterprises in Vietnam often receive rumours or derogatory comments

about their private life.

Table 2. Descriptive statistic of observed variables

Code	Content	Source	Mean
Darktriad traits			
	Machiavellianism		
MA1	It's not wise to tell your secrets	Jones & Paulhus (2014)	3.376
MA2	I like to use clever manipulation to get my way		3.646
MA5	It's wise to keep track of information that you can use against people later		3.652
MA6	You should wait for the right time to get back at people		3.604
MA7	There are things you should hide from other people to preserve your reputation		3.498
MA8	Make sure your plans benefit yourself, not others		3.545
MA9	Most people can be manipulated		3.492
	Narcissism		
NA1	People see me as a natural leader	Jones & Paulhus (2014)	3.6
NA2	I like being the center of attention		3.604
NA3	Many group activities tend to be dull without me		3.634
NA6	I enjoy if someone compliments me.		3.563
NA7	I have been compared to famous people		3.615
NA10	I am important to everyone	Qualitative research	3.599
	Psychopathy		
PS2	I like to deal with dangerous situations.	Jones & Paulhus (2014)	3.583
PS4	People often say I'm out of control		3.556
PS5	It's true that I can be mean to others		3.556
PS6	People who mess with me always regret it.		3.556
PS7	I have gotten into trouble with the law.		3.578
PS8	To get what I want, I'm willing to say anything	Qualitative research	3.587
Workplace bullying			
WPB1	Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	Einarsen et al. (2009)	3.347
WPB2	Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial tasks.		3.338
WPB3	Spreading of gossip and rumors about you.		3.284
WPB4	Being ignored or excluded.		3.239
WPB5	Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitude, or private life		3.384
WPB6	Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job.		3.35

Code	Content	Source	Mean
WPB7	Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes.		3.349
WPB8	Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach.		3.307
WPB10	Practical jokes carried out by people you do not get along with.		3.357
WPB11	Having allegations made against you.		3.255
WPB12	Being the subject of excessive sarcasm.		3.356
WPB13	Someone withholding information which affects your performance.		3.357
WPB15	Having your opinions ignored.		3.319
WPB16	Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines.		3.353
WPB17	Excessive monitoring of your work.		3.299
WPB19	Being exposed to an unmanageable workload.		3.348
WPB20	Asking to complete work with higher results than usual	Qualitative research	3.335
WPB21	Being not recognized for your work achievements		3.351
WPB22	Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger.	Einarsen et al. (2009)	3.25
WPB23	Intimidating behavior such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way.		3.306

After analysis, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the factors in the formal scale is greater than 0.7 and the corrected item-total correlation in each factor is greater than 0.3. Therefore, it can be concluded that the scale is reliable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Table 3. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients

Factor	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Workplace Bullying			
Workplace bullying (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.943)	WPB1	0.899	0.943
	WPB2	0.891	0.943
	WPB3	0.899	0.943
	WPB4	0.894	0.943
	WPB5	0.897	0.943
	WPB6	0.894	0.943
	WPB7	0.89	0.943
	WPB8	0.898	0.943
	WPB10	0.891	0.943
	WPB11	0.875	0.943

Factor	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
	WPB12	0.893	0.943
	WPB13	0.897	0.943
	WPB15	0.896	0.943
	WPB16	0.903	0.943
	WPB17	0.903	0.943
	WPB19	0.896	0.943
	WPB20	0.898	0.943
	WPB21	0.893	0.943
	WPB22	0.738	0.945
	WPB23	0.741	0.945
Employee's Dark-triad			
Machiavellianism (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.935)	MA1	0.808	0.924
	MA2	0.826	0.922
	MA5	0.826	0.922
	MA6	0.799	0.925
	MA7	0.744	0.93
	MA8	0.77	0.927
	MA9	0.76	0.928
Narcissism (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.913)	NA1	0.777	0.894
	NA2	0.775	0.895
	NA3	0.735	0.901
	NA6	0.733	0.901
	NA7	0.754	0.898
	NA10	0.765	0.896
Psychopathy (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.926)	PS2	0.783	0.913
	PS4	0.792	0.911
	PS5	0.777	0.913
	PS6	0.761	0.916
	PS7	0.81	0.909
	PS8	0.792	0.911

The results of EFA analysis are shown in Table 4 and Table 5, the KMO coefficient is 0.976 (between 0.5 and 1), the sig. value of Bartlett's test is $0.000 < 0.05$, eigenvalue coefficient > 1 , total variance extracted $> 50\%$. This shows that the observed variables in the factors have a high degree of correlation and cohesion, as well as the factor analysis is appropriate (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 4. KMO test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.976
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	49857.657
	df	741
	Sig.	0.000

Table 5. Rotated matrix

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
WPB17	0.917			
WPB16	0.915			
WPB20	0.913			
WPB3	0.91			
WPB12	0.909			
WPB6	0.908			
WPB2	0.908			
WPB21	0.908			
WPB5	0.907			
WPB19	0.907			
WPB8	0.906			
WPB1	0.906			
WPB4	0.905			
WPB7	0.903			
WPB15	0.903			
WPB13	0.902			
WPB10	0.896			
WPB11	0.893			
WPB23	0.763			
WPB22	0.753			
MA5		0.878		
MA2		0.877		
MA1		0.864		

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
MA6		0.859		
MA8		0.832		
MA9		0.825		
MA7		0.81		
PS7			0.876	
PS4			0.861	
PS8			0.859	
PS2			0.85	
PS5			0.849	
PS6			0.832	
NA2				0.854
NA1				0.849
NA10				0.84
NA7				0.835
NA6				0.819
NA3				0.814

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) coefficient of these factors is also greater than 0.5 and the outerloading of the factors are greater than 0.7 (Table 6). Therefore, it can be concluded that the research scale reaches convergence validity. Besides, the Composite Reliability (CR) coefficient of the factors in the model is all greater than 0.7, so the research scale is reach reliability validity (Hair et al. 2021). The HTMT indexes in the matrix, which range from 0.030 to 0.169, are all smaller than 0.85, therefore, the scale reaches discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2015).

Table 6. Convergent and Discriminant validity results

Factor	Outer loading		CR	AVE
	Min	Max		
Employee's dark-triad traits				
MA	0.802	0.876	0.95	0.711
NA	0.811	0.853	0.93	0.697
PS	0.835	0.873	0.94	0.730
Workplace bullying				
WPB	0.762	0.912	0.956	0.8

The study carried out bootstrapping with 5000 samples to test the hypotheses in the proposed research model. According to the results in Table 7, the hypothesis H2 and H3 are accepted at the 1% significance level due to the p-value < 0.01. In contrast, hypothesis H1 is not accepted with p-value > 0.01.

Table 7. Research hypothesis test results

Hypothesis	Relationship	β	Standard deviation	t-value	p-value	Result
H1	MA -> WPB	-0.06	0,034	1,712	0,087	Rejected
H2	NA -> WPB	0.151	0.028	5.409	0,000	Accepted
H3	PS -> WPB	0.123	0.028	4.393	0,000	Accepted

5. Discussion

The analysis results did not find a relationship between the machiavellianism personality and the workplace bullying of employees with the $p\text{-value} = 0.087 > 0.05$. Hypothesis H1 was rejected. The results of the present study are similar to the studies of Dåderman & Ragestål-Impola (2019) and Fatima (2016) when the above relationship was not found. While the studies of Fernández-del-Río et al. (2021) and Linton & Power (2013) find highly machiavellian individuals more likely to fall victim to workplace bullying. This can be explained by the fact that machiavellianism employees are often shady and cunning (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012), have personal strategies to manipulate and take advantage of others (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) to achieve personal goals without regard to organizations or other individual goals (Spain et al., 2014). Therefore, they are not interested in other people's actions to achieve their goals (including workplace bullying). Besides, according to Jonason et al. (2012), people with a high degree of Machiavellianism also show significantly higher self-perception than narcissistic people, they may not appreciate harassment and bullying behaviours from others can cause difficulties or affect them. The above arguments lead to the result that there is no relationship between machiavellianism personality and workplace bullying of employees.

According to the results, employees' narcissism personality has an influence on their being bullied in the workplace with the coefficient $\beta = 0.151$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.000$. Therefore, hypothesis H2 is accepted, this effect is positive and the confidence level is 99%. It can be said that employees with higher narcissism personality are more likely to be bullied in the workplace. This result is consistent with the target-behaviour mechanism by Neilsen & Knardahl (2015). Highly narcissism personality employees often have a lot of pride, excessive self-interest, and inflated self-image (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). At the same time, they will also feel contempt for their co-workers when they feel that their co-workers may be obstructing (Judge et al., 2006; Penney & Spector, 2002; Reidy et al., 2008). From there, they easily create trouble, cause inhibitions for others, even violate social standards of polite, friendly interaction and instigate workplace bullying from others (co-workers / superiors) and become a victim of workplace bullying. The results of the present study are like those of Fatima (2016). In particular, in Vietnam, with a high collectivist culture, employees in a group/organization, who engage in unfriendly, provocative and disdainful behaviours, will attract attention and are susceptible to the rest of the population having negative attitudes and behaviours towards them, specifically workplace bullying.

Finally, the results found a relationship between employees with psychopathy personality and workplace bullying with a coefficient of $\beta = 0.123$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.000$. Hypothesis H3 is accepted, this effect is positive and has 99% confidence. In other words, employees with more psychopathy personality are more likely to be bullied in the workplace. Research by Linton & Power (2013) also found that

people who were bullied had higher scores on psychopathy personality than others. Although, this personality trait is found mainly in the perpetrators of bullying, the present research results are consistent with the target-behaviour mechanism by Neilsen & Knardahl (2015). Employees with psychopathy personality often treat colleagues poorly, including bullying, public criticism, coercion, and human rights violations (Boddy, 2011). Since then, it is difficult for them to get along in the collective, especially in a working environment that promotes collectivism as high as in Vietnam. In addition, often having a lot of anti-social behavior, breaking social norms easily creates resistance, disobedience to managers and violations of the principle of submission to superiors. respected in Vietnamese culture. In addition, employees with psychopathy personality often have many anti-social behaviours, breaking social norms, easily creating resistance, disobedience to managers and violations. violate the principle of obedience to superiors. While these principles are often respected in Vietnamese working culture. For the above reasons, employees with psychopathy personality often attract negative attention, easily create conflicts in the workplace and thereby become the target of aggression and bullying in the workplace from co-workers and superiors.

6. Conclusions

With the aim of understanding the relationship between dark-triad traits and workplace bullying, the study used both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Quantitative research is used to adjust the scale and is carried out in two phases: group discussion and expert interview. Next, quantitative research is used to analyze the collected data. Quantitative research is also carried out through two phases: pilot-test and formal. Pilot-test phase collected 207 valid answers, that were used to test the reliability and convergence of the scale by SPSS software. Finally, the formal study was conducted with 1206 respondents, the collected data was analyzed using SPSS and SmartPLS software. For employees' dark-triad traits traits, including *narcissism* and *psychopathy*, were found to have a possitive effect on increasing their incidence of workplace bullying. Meanwhile, the employee *machiavellianism* personality found no relationship with their being bullied. Employee *narcissism* was found to be the most influential in increasing their incidence of bullying.

Research results show that dark-triad traits traits make employees more likely to be bullied. Therefore, when recruiting, managers should have tests to assess the personality characteristics of candidates to get evaluation and suitable working position. Candidates with highly darktriad personality traits such as narcissism or psychopathy, if hired, should be placed in more suitable positions and given more attention as they are more likely to become victims of workplace bullying. Therefore, caring and controlling employees with these personality traits will help limit the potential for workplace bullying to happen to them as well as prevent the

development of bullying behavior.

At the same time, HR managers can design other soft skills training programs to limit the likelihood that employees or candidates with high dark-triad personality traits are likely to become victims of workplace bullying. For example, for a candidate with a high score in narcissism or psychopathy personality trait, it may be possible to add soft skills that are beneficial for interacting with others and team working such as: skills to have a positive attitude at work, teamwork skills, communication skills... Thereby helping them improve their interactions with colleagues at work.

First, the current research sample is employees working at enterprises in Vietnam, so it is not highly representative. The prospective study sample could be staff in other organisations, or other regions and countries. The present study is a cross-sectional study, therefore future studies should be long-term studies, to examine the causal relationship of workplace bullying behavior and the victim's personality. Human personality is very complex, further studies can study other personality traits, especially light-triad personality traits, which are of recent interest.

References

- Al-Hyari, H. S. A. (2023). Job Security as a Mediating Variable between Innovative Leadership and Innovative Work Behavior among Employees. *Journal of System and Management Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 532-574.
- Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2009). Workplace victimization: Aggression from the target's perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, Vol. 60, 717-741.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Perugini, M., Szarota, P., De Vries, R. E., Di Blas, L., ... & De Raad, B. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, Vol.86, No. 2, 356.
- Baughman, H. M., Dearing, S., Giammarco, E., & Vernon, P. A. (2012). Relationships between bullying behaviours and the Dark Triad: A study with adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 52, No. 5, 571-575.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 2, 410-424.
- Boddy, C. R. (2011). Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace. *Journal of business ethics*, Vol. 100, No. 3, 367-379.
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: a theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol 91, No. 5, 998-1012.
- Brotsky, C. M. (1976). *The harassed worker*. DC Heath & Co.

- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: incidence and impact. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 64-80.
- Dåderman, A. M., & Ragnestål-Impola, C. (2019). Workplace bullies, not their victims, score high on the dark triad and extraversion, and low on agreeableness and honesty-humility. *Heliyon*, Vol. 5, No. 10, e02609.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of management Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 2, 331-351.
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International journal of manpower*, Vol. 20, No. 1/2, 16-27.
- Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2020). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. In *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (pp. 3-53). CRC press.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & stress*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 24-44.
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. R. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 381-401.
- Felblinger, D. M. (2009). Bullying, incivility, and disruptive behaviours in the healthcare setting: identification, impact, and intervention. *Frontiers of health services management*, Vol. 25, No. 4, 13-23.
- Fernández-del-Río, E., Ramos-Villagrasa, P. J., & Escartín, J. (2021). The incremental effect of Dark personality over the Big Five in workplace bullying: Evidence from perpetrators and targets. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 168, 110291.
- Glasø, L., Matthiesen, S. B., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of workplace bullying portray a general victim personality profile? *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, Vol. 48, No. 4, 313-319.
- Glomb, T. M. (2002). Workplace anger and aggression: informing conceptual models with data from specific encounters. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 20-36.
- Greenberg, L., & Barling, J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression against coworkers, subordinates and supervisors: The roles of person behaviours and perceived workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20, No. 6, 897-913.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). Sage publications.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European business review*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 2-24.

- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, Vol. 43, No. 1, 115-135.
- Hoel, H., Glasø, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C. L., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Leadership styles as predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 453-468.
- Jonason, P. K., Luevano, V. X., & Adams, H. M. (2012). How the Dark Triad traits predict relationship choices. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 53, No. 3, 180-184.
- Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Machiavellianism. In & R. M. R. Leary, *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 93-108). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Differentiating the 15 dark triad within the interpersonal circumplex. In *Handbook of interpersonal psychology: Theory, research, assessment and therapeutic interventions* (pp. 249-267).
- Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: relationship of the narcissistic personality to self-and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 91, No. 4, 762-776.
- Keashly, L., & Harvey, S. (2005). Emotional Abuse in the Workplace. In *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 201-235). American Psychological Association.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and victims*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 119-126.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 165-184.
- Linton, D. K., & Power, J. L. (2013). The personality traits of workplace bullies are often shared by their victims: Is there a dark side to victims? *Personality and individual differences*, Vol. 54, No. 6, 738-743.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of personality*, Vol. 60, No. 2, 175-215.
- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the dark triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 183-204.
- Neumann, C. S., Kaufman, S. B., ten Brinke, L., Yaden, D. B., Hyde, E., & Tsykayama, E. (2020). Light and dark trait subtypes of human personality—A multi-study person-centered approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 164, 110121.
- Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work & Stress*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 309-332.

- Nielsen, M. B., & Knardahl, S. (2015). Is workplace bullying related to the personality traits of victims? A two-year prospective study. *Work & Stress*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 128-149.
- Nielsen, M. B., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2017). Exposure to workplace harassment and the Five Factor Model of personality: A meta-analysis. *Personality and individual differences*, Vol. 104, 195-206.
- Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and organizational Psychology*, Vol. 83, No. 4, 955-979.
- Nguyen, M. H., Luan, N. V., & Khoa, B. T. (2021), Employer Attractiveness and Employee Performance: An Exploratory Study, *Journal of System and Management Sciences*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 97-123. doi:10.33168/JSMS.2021.0107
- Ones, D. S. (2005). Personality at work: Raising awareness and correcting misconceptions. *Human Performance*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 389-404.
- Paal, T., & Bereczkei, T. (2007). Adult theory of mind, cooperation, Machiavellianism: The effect of mindreading on social relations. *Personality and individual differences*, Vol. 43, No. 3, 541-551.
- Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and psychopathology*, Vol. 21, No. 3, 913-938.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of selection and Assessment*, Vol. 10, No. 1-2, 126-134.
- Pilch, I., & Turska, E. (2015). Relationships between Machiavellianism, organizational culture, and workplace bullying: Emotional abuse from the target's and the perpetrator's perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 128, No. 1, 83-93.
- Pletzer, J. L., Bentvelzen, M., Oostrom, J. K., & De Vries, R. E. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relations between personality and workplace deviance: Big Five versus HEXACO. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 112, 369-383.
- Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2012). How "dark" are the Dark Triad traits? Examining the perceived darkness of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 53, No. 7, 884-889.
- Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., Foster, J. D., & Martinez, M. A. (2008). Effects of narcissistic entitlement and exploitativeness on human physical aggression. *Personality and individual differences*, Vol. 44, No. 4, 865-875.
- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., & Shannon, C. A. (2006). Patterns of workplace harassment, gender, and use of services: An update. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 379-393.
- Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2011). Organisational causes of workplace bullying. In *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (pp. 227-243).

- Samsudin, E. Z., Isahak, M., Rampal, S., Rosnah, I., & Zakaria, M. I. (2020). Organisational antecedents of workplace victimisation: The role of organisational climate, culture, leadership, support, and justice in predicting junior doctors' exposure to bullying at work. *The International journal of health planning and management*, Vol. 35, No. 1, 346-367.
- Schat, A. C., Frone, M. R., & Kelloway, E. K. (2006). Prevalence of Workplace Aggression in the U.S. Workforce: Findings From a National Study. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. J. Hurrell, Jr. *Handbook of workplace violence*, 47-89.
- Spain, S. M., Harms, P., & LeBreton, J. M. (2014). The dark side of personality at work. *Journal of organizational behavior*, Vol. 35, No. S1, S41-S60.
- Srivastava, S., & Agarwal, S. (2020). Workplace bullying and intention to leave: a moderated mediation model of emotional exhaustion and supervisory support. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 6, 1547-1563.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of management*, Vol. 33, No. 3, 261-289.
- Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying–psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 203-214.
- Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 58, 425-452.
- Williams, K. M., Nathanson, C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Identifying and profiling scholastic cheaters: Their personality, cognitive ability, and motivation. *Journal of experimental psychology: applied*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 293-307.
- Workplace Bullying Institute (WBI) (2014). Workplace Bullying Survey Retrieved from: <http://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/WBI-2014-US-Survey.pdf>
- Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2002). Individual antecedents of bullying: Victims and perpetrators. In *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace* (pp. 183-202). CRC Press.